

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CHRISTOPHER HULSKAMPER,

Defendant.

2:06-cr-00147-RJC-LRL

ORDER

Christopher Hulskamper is currently in custody of the Bureau of Prisons pursuant to a judgment on revocation of supervised release entered February 16, 2016. (ECF No. 36.) It has come to the attention of the Court that a discrepancy exists between the oral judgment on revocation given during Mr. Hulskamper's revocation hearing on January 15, 2016, (ECF No. 35), and the written judgment subsequently entered, (ECF No. 36). Accordingly, the Court now contemplates entering an amended judgment under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 36, to correct a clerical error in the written judgment so it may reflect the clear intention of the Court as expressed at the revocation hearing.

I. FACTS AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

After serving a sentence of one hundred months in federal prison, Mr. Hulskamper violated the terms of his supervised release, and was brought before this Court for a revocation hearing on January 15, 2016. (*See* ECF No. 35.) During the hearing, Assistant United States

1 Attorney Andrew Duncan and Probation Officer Aaron Mauga joined together in recommending
2 a sentence of twenty-four months of imprisonment and twelve months of supervised release to
3 follow. In rebuttal, Federal Public Defender Paul Riddle asserted that the guideline range for Mr.
4 Hulskamper's violations was eight to fourteen months, and recommended a sentence of fourteen
5 months of imprisonment and no supervised release.

6 After listening to the attorneys' arguments and Mr. Hulskamper's statement, the Court
7 imposed a sentence of twenty-four months of imprisonment with no supervised release to follow.
8 The Court's ruling was clear, and restated a second time at the close of the hearing. Moreover,
9 the oral judgment was expressly based on the Court's findings that Mr. Hulskamper would not be
10 benefitted by supervised release, is incapable of abiding by the terms of supervised release, and
11 is "violent and a danger to others and himself when he is out of custody."

12 Despite the Court's imposition of twenty-four months of imprisonment at the revocation
13 hearing, the written judgment reflected a sentence of twelve months of imprisonment with no
14 supervised release to follow. Due to this discrepancy, the Court is now considering an amended
15 judgment under Rule 36 to correct the error in the written judgment, that it may reflect a sentence
16 of twenty-four months of imprisonment with no supervised release to follow. The Court is
17 informed that Mr. Hulskamper is due to be released from custody, based on the twelve-month
18 sentence in the written judgment, in January 2017.

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

